

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

<b>Application No.</b>	10/711,610	<b>Group Art Unit</b>	3644
<b>Applicants</b>	William R. McCoskey et al.	<b>Docket No.</b>	02-0033A (BOE 0503 PA)
<b>Filed</b>	September 28, 2004	<b>Examiner</b>	Barefoot, Galen L.
<b>For</b>	OPERATIONAL GROUND SUPPORT SYSTEM		
<b>Date</b>	June 27, 2006		

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Dear Sir:

In response to the non-final Office Action mailed on February 27, 2006 ("Office Action") in the above-referenced patent application, Applicants hereby request that the following amendments be entered and remarks be considered. A petition for a one month extension of time is being filed concurrently herewith.

**Listing of Claims** begin on page 2 of this paper.

**Remarks** begin on page 7 of this paper.

### **LISTING OF CLAIMS**

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

1. (currently amended) An integrated operational ground mobility and support system comprising:

at least one aircraft, at least one of said at least one aircraft having at least one service opening on at least one side of said at least one aircraft; ~~and~~

at least one airport interface terminal docking port having at least one ground support service sub-system, mating with said at least one aircraft at said at least one service opening, and comprising a plurality of servicing levels; and

a remote baggage handling system that is remotely located from and transfers baggage to and from said at least one airport interface terminal

said at least one ground support service sub-system providing a plurality of services, at least one of which being a non-cargo service, through one of said at least one service opening and on said plurality of levels.

2. (cancelled)

3. (currently amended) A ground support system as in claim ~~2~~ 1 wherein said remote baggage handling system scans said baggage for at least one of weapons, explosives, and unpermitted objects.

4. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one aircraft comprises a flight deck area that is isolated from said at least one service opening.

5. (original) A ground support system as in claim 4 wherein said flight deck area is elevated from a passenger compartment of said at least one aircraft.

6. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one ground support service sub-system is selected from at least one of a passenger ingress/egress system, a cargo ingress/egress system, an aircraft primary service system, an aircraft secondary service system, a security system, and a health and maintenance monitoring system.

7. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one aircraft and said at least one airport interface terminal docking port comprise a floor for passenger ingress and egress.

8. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one aircraft and said at least one airport interface terminal docking port comprise a floor for cargo ingress and egress.

9. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one aircraft comprise a first plurality of primary service couplers and said at least one airport interface terminal docking port comprise a second plurality of primary service couplers that mate with said first plurality of primary service couplers.

10. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one airport docking port comprises a cargo elevator platform.

11. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one ground support service sub-system comprises passenger transport modules.

12. (original) A ground support system as in claim 11 wherein said at least one aircraft is configured to receive said passenger transport modules.

13. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one airport interface terminal docking port is configured to shuttle at least one passenger transport module to and from said at least one aircraft.

14. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one airport interface terminal docking port is configured to shuttle at least one passenger transport module to and from a side of said at least one aircraft, and cargo to and from a nose of said at least one aircraft.

15. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 further comprising an aircraft terminal mating system.

16. (original) A ground support system as in claim 15 wherein said aircraft terminal mating system is in the form of a machine vision technology system.

17. (original) A ground support system as in claim 15 wherein said aircraft terminal mating system comprises a docking coupler.

18. (original) A ground support system as in claim 15 wherein said aircraft terminal mating system comprises a global positioning system.

19. (original) A ground support system as in claim 15 wherein said aircraft terminal mating system comprises a precision guidance system that follows a guideline in mating the at least one aircraft to said at least one airport interface terminal docking port.

20. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one airport interface terminal docking port comprises a terminal carry-on system.

21. (original) A ground support system as in claim 20 wherein said terminal carry-on system comprises at least one carry-on transport module, said at least one airport interface terminal docking port shuttling said at least one carry-on transport module to and from said at least one aircraft.

22. (original) A ground support system as in claim 21 wherein said at least one carry-on transport module is bar-coded.

23. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one airport interface terminal docking port comprises at least one bar code reader that reads bar codes on cargo transported to and from the at least one aircraft.

24. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least airport interface terminal docking port comprises at least one cargo carousel.

25. (original) A ground support system as in claim 24 wherein said at least one cargo carousel has a plurality of feed directions.

26. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said at least one airport interface terminal docking port extends to mate with said at least one aircraft.

27. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 wherein said plurality of service openings comprise openings selected from a nose opening, a port side opening, a starboard side opening, a terminal level opening, and a cargo level opening.

28. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 further comprising a fuel supply and drain system comprising:

fueling ports with flow back and vapor collecting jackets supplying fuel to said at least one aircraft; and

tarmac spill traps collecting fluids proximate said fueling ports.

29. (original) A ground support system as in claim 1 further comprising a brake cooling and drain system comprising:

at least one vent coupled within a tarmac;

a fluid reservoir configured for containment below a tarmac, to couple said at least one vent, and to collect fluids proximate said at least one aircraft;

an air supply line directing air through said fluid reservoir and said at least one vent at said at least one aircraft; and

a fluid drain collecting fluids within said fluid reservoir.

30-38 (cancelled)

39. (currently amended) An integrated operational ground mobility and support system comprising:

at least one aircraft, at least one of said at least one aircraft having a plurality of service openings on at least one side of said at least one aircraft; and

at least one airport interface terminal docking port, at least one of said at least one airport interface terminal docking port having at least one ground support service sub-system, mating with said at least one aircraft at and comprising a plurality of corridors and bridgeheads associated with said plurality of service openings;

said at least one aircraft having a passenger servicing bridge having at least double door jetway;

said at least one ground support service sub-system providing a plurality of services simultaneously on multiple levels to said at least one aircraft through said plurality of service openings, at least one of said plurality of services being a non-cargo based service.

40. (currently amended) A ground support system as in claim 39 wherein said ~~plurality of corridors comprise~~ at least double door jetway includes at least two corridors.:

~~a first class corridor; and~~

~~a general class corridor.~~

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments presented above and the following remarks is requested. Claims 1, 3, 39, and 40 are currently amended. Claims 2 and 30-38 have been cancelled.

#### **A. Apparently Conflicting Claims**

The Examiner stated that claims 1 and 30 of the present application conflict with claims 1 and 31 of Application No. 10/847,739 (“the ‘739 Application”) and required Applicants to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. Claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitations of claim 2 and thus Applicants believe that it is not in conflict with claim 1 of the ‘739 Application. Claim 30 of the present application has been cancelled.

#### **B. Claim Rejections**

##### **1. Claims 1-2, 4-36, 37-38, 39-40**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 4-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,730,359) in view of O’Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435). The Examiner stated the following:

- Referring to Figs. 7-9 of Anderson, the terms first class and general class do not add structure to the claims in 39-40.
- It would have been obvious to put passenger seats on the pallets of Anderson as taught by O’Neill because he shows that either cargo or passengers can be placed on moveable pallets.
- It would have been obvious to load/unload multi levels of mixed services of passengers and cargo simultaneously as taught by Szendrodi.
- Bar-coding on cargo/luggage is well known.

- It would have been obvious to provide the terminal of Anderson with well known vision and GPS docking for accurate docking.
- It would have been obvious to have aircraft refueling at the terminal which includes drains and vapor control.

2. Claims 3 and 36

The Examiner also rejected Claims 3 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of O'Neill and Szendrodi as set forth above and further in view of Husseiny (5,600,303). The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to provide the terminal of Anderson with security as taught by Husseiny because it provides protection to customers.

3. Claims 39 and 40

The Examiner also rejected Claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konya (6,863,243) in view of O'Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435). The Examiner stated it would have been obvious to put passenger seats on the pallets of Konya as taught by O'Neill because he shows that either cargo or passengers can be placed on moveable pallets. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to further load and unload the multi-levels of mixed services of passengers and cargo simultaneously as taught by Szendrodi.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

**C. Argument**

1. Claims 1-2, 4-36, 37-38, 39-40

The rejections of Claims 1-2 and 4-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,730,359) in view of O'Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435) are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitations of claim 2, which recites that the ground support system claimed in claim 1 further comprises a remote baggage handling system that is remotely located from and transfers baggage to and from the airport interface terminal. Claim 39 is currently amended to recite the aircraft as having a passenger servicing bridge having at least a double door jetway. Support for the amendment is found in paragraph 124 of the specification. Claim 40 is currently amended to recite that the double door jetway of claim 39 includes at least two corridors. Support for the amendment is found in paragraph 124 of the specification. No new matter has been added to any of the currently amended claims.

There is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner. Anderson is directed solely to the unloading and loading of freight on and off a freight aircraft, not a passenger aircraft. O'Neill is directed to the use of palletized package members on which passengers, baggage, and freight can be loaded in the terminal and then moved to the aircraft to be loaded. Szendrodi is directed to a baggage-handling system in which baggage is moved separately through the terminal from the passengers but generally in the same direction to and from the aircraft, the baggage route through the terminal being below the floor over which the passengers move. O'Neill and Szendrodi are thus both directed to passenger aircrafts, unlike Anderson. Accordingly, there is no motivation and there would not be any motivation to incorporate any passenger-related systems, devices, or components taught by either O'Neill and/or Szendrodi into the loading and unloading system of Anderson.

The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to put passenger seats on the pallets of Anderson. Anderson does not even disclose or mention the use of pallets. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious for such placement.

As previously stated above, Szendrodi is directed to a baggage-handling system. Thus there would be no motivation, suggestion, or teaching (and indeed there is none) to combine the teachings of Anderson, which is directed solely to freight aircrafts, with Szendrodi, which is directed to passenger aircrafts, to render obvious the invention of the present application.

In addition, neither O'Neill nor Szendrodi teaches or suggests a remote baggage handling system that is remotely located from the terminal, as claimed in claim 1. The baggage handling systems of Szendrodi and O'Neill are located in the terminal itself. In the present application, however, Applicants' baggage handling system is remotely located from the airport terminal in order to increase airport safety. See, e.g., paragraph 128 of the specification.

The Examiner also stated, without providing any support (i.e., specific or otherwise), that it would have been obvious to provide the terminal of Anderson with vision and GPS docking for accurate docking, and to use bar-coding on cargo/luggage. Applicants respectfully traverse that the Examiner is taking Official Notice of the stated items without concrete evidence for support as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). The limitations of an aircraft terminal mating system in the form of a machine vision technology system, of an aircraft terminal mating system that has a GPS, and the use of a bar code reader that reads cargo transported to and from an aircraft are not known in the art and are not taught or suggested by Anderson or any other reference cited by the Examiner. It is not appropriate to rely solely on common knowledge in the art without evidentiary support in the record as the

principal evidence upon which a rejection is based. In re Zurko, 258 F.3d 1379, 1386, 59 USPQ2d 1693, 1697 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

With respect to claim 3, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to scan baggage at a remote baggage handling station for weapons, explosives, or other unpermitted objects.

As to claim 25, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a cargo carousel having a plurality of feed directions.

With respect to claim 28, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a fuel supply and drain system as claimed.

As to claim 29, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a brake cooling and drain system as claimed.

Finally, with respect to claims 39 and 40, again there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a passenger servicing bridge having at least a double door jetway or that such double door jetway includes at least two corridors.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4-29, and 39-40 are patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

2. Claims 3 and 36

The rejection of Claims 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of O'Neill and Szendrodi as set forth above and further in view of Husseiny (5,600,303) is also respectfully traversed. The rejection as to claim 36 is moot because that claim has been cancelled.

As to claim 3, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson, O'Neill, Szendrodi, and Husseiny in the manner proffered by the Examiner. The first three references were previously discussed above. Although the fourth reference, Husseiny, is directed to a detector for detection of concealed explosives, drugs, and contraband using x-rays imaging and the like, the cited references, either alone or in any combination thereof, do not teach or suggest a remote baggage system scanning baggage from a remote location as claimed in claim 3. As previously discussed above, Applicants' baggage handling system is remotely located from the airport terminal in order to increase airport safety. See, e.g., paragraph 128 of the specification.

Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

3. Claims 39 and 40

The rejections of Claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konya (6,863,243) in view of O'Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435) are respectfully traversed.

Konya is directed solely to an aircraft servicing system. O'Neill and Szendrodi were previously discussed above. There is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine

them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to arrive at the inventions claimed in claims 39 and 40. In particular, none of the cited references teach or even suggest providing a passenger servicing bridge having at least a double door jetway or that such double door jetway includes at least two corridors.

Accordingly, claims 39-40 are patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

**D. Conclusion**

In view of the amendments and the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any fees required or credit any overpayment in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 50-3195.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: New York, New York  
June 27, 2006

OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY  
& BROITMAN P.C.  
**Customer No. 44702**

By:                     /Andres N. Madrid/                      
Andres N. Madrid  
Registration No. 40,710

250 Park Avenue, Suite 825  
New York, New York 10177-0899  
Telephone: (212) 681-0600  
Fax: (212) 681-0300